

1 Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)
2 karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com

BARTLIT BECK LLP

3 1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200
4 Denver, Colorado 80202
5 Telephone: (303) 592-3100

6 Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)
7 hnam@kaplanfox.com

KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

8 850 Third Avenue
9 New York, NY 10022
10 Tel.: (212) 687-1980

*Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In
re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

11 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)
12 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com

**FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
LLP**

14 Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor
15 San Francisco, CA 94111
16 Telephone: (415) 591-7500

17 Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)
18 cvarney@cravath.com

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

19 825 Eighth Avenue
20 New York, New York 10019
21 Telephone: (212) 474-1000

*Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in Epic
Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*

Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643)
bglackin@agutah.gov

**OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY
GENERAL**

160 E 300 S, 5th Floor
PO Box 140872
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872
Telephone: (801) 366-0260

Counsel for the Plaintiff States

Douglas J. Dixon (SBN 275389)
ddixon@hueston.com

HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP

620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1300
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Telephone: (949) 229-8640

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Match Group, LLC, et
al.*

Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
Telephone: (415) 442-1000

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al

26 [Additional counsel appear on signature page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

**IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

This Document Relates To:

**JOINT PROPOSED JURY
QUESTIONNAIRE**

Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.,
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Judge: Hon. James Donato

*In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.,
Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

*Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et
al.*, Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD

Subject to limited objections identified below, the Parties jointly propose the following case-specific questions to be added to the Court's standard online, pre-service questionnaire for prospective jurors.

I. JOINT PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What are the specific duties and responsibilities of your job?
2. Do you have either strong positive or negative feelings about any of the following companies?
 - a. Epic Games: ☐ Yes (Strong Positive) ☐ Yes (Strong Negative) ☐ No
 - b. Match Group (Match, Tinder, OkCupid, PlentyofFish, and OurTime) : ☐ Yes (Strong Positive) ☐ Yes (Strong Negative) ☐ No
 - c. Google: ☐ Yes (Strong Positive) ☐ Yes (Strong Negative) ☐ No

If you answered Yes for any of the above, please explain:

3. Do you own, or have you owned, a phone or other mobile device that uses the following operating systems. Check all that apply.

Apple Phone	Current <input type="checkbox"/>	Past <input type="checkbox"/>
Android Phone	Current <input type="checkbox"/>	Past <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	Current <input type="checkbox"/>	Past <input type="checkbox"/>
None – I haven't owned a phone or other mobile device <input type="checkbox"/>		

If you checked any of the above, please list the devices (e.g., iPhone 12, Samsung Galaxy S23, Motorola Moto G, Google Pixel 6, etc.):

If you have downloaded apps onto your phone, from where have you downloaded those apps. Check all that apply.

Apple App Store	<input type="checkbox"/>
Google Play Store	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you checked other, please list where you have downloaded apps:

If you checked Google Play Store, please describe your use now or in the past and describe whether you have had an especially good or bad experience:

4. Have you ever spent money on the following:

Online Gaming	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Online Dating	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Subscriptions to online content	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other online digital content (E.g., e-books, songs, etc.)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered Yes for any of the above, how often do you spend money on online gaming, online dating, subscriptions to online content or other online digital content?

- 1 ☐ Not at all ☐ Not very often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Often ☐ Very Often
- 2 5. Have you ever used an online dating app on your phone or other mobile devices?
- 3 Yes ☐
- 4 No ☐
- 5 If yes, please explain which app(s) you have used, for how long, and your overall
experience (positive / negative, etc.):
- 6 If you have ever spent money on online dating, did you make the purchase in the app, on a
website, or both?:
- 7 6. Have you, or someone you closely know, ever developed an application (“app”) for a
8 smartphone or other mobile device? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 9 If yes, please describe:
- 10 7. As part of your employment, have you ever worked for or with a company that develops
applications (“apps”) for smartphones or other mobile devices? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 11 If yes, please describe:
- 12 8. Do you have any education, or have you received any training, in antitrust laws, whether at
13 work or at school? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 14 If yes, please describe:
- 15 9. Have you or anyone close to you ever been involved in any way with an antitrust matter or
dispute? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 16 If yes, please describe:
- 17 10. Please list your social, political, non-profit, professional, trade, civic, or religious
18 organizations, clubs, groups, or other affiliations, any offices or leadership positions you
have held.
- 19 11. Have you, a family member, or someone close to you ever had any education, training,
20 work, or other experience involving the following? Circle all that apply.
- 21 a. Tech Industry: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close
- 22 b. Law / legal field: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close
- 23 c. Contracts: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close
- 24 d. Data management or analysis: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close
- 25 e. Data security: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close
- 26 f. Computer science, programming, or engineering: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes,
someone close
- 27 g. Online games / dating services / mobile applications: Yes, self / Yes, family /
28 Yes, someone close

h. Information technology: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close

i. Statistics: Yes, self / Yes, family / Yes, someone close

If you checked any of the above, please identify the person and describe the training or experience:

12. Where do you get most of your news? (circle all that apply)

a. Newspaper (which ones?):

b. TV(channels?):

c. Social Media (which platforms – e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram?):

d. Radio or Podcasts (what programs?):

e. Magazines (which ones?):

f. Other Sources?:

II. GOOGLE’S OBJECTIONS

Question 3: Google objects to the following subparts to Question 3:

- “If you have downloaded apps onto your phone, from where have you downloaded those apps. Check all that apply. “
- “If you checked other, please list where you have downloaded apps.”
- “If you checked Google Play Store, please describe your use now or in the past and describe whether you have had an especially good or bad experience.”

Google submits that these subparts are inappropriate for a questionnaire and are prejudicial to Google. First, the questions are unnecessary and impose a burden on prospective jurors to complete potentially lengthy narrative answers. Prospective jurors will have already identified the operating system of their current and former mobile devices, making additional questions about where jurors download apps partially redundant (Apple iPhones can only download apps from Apple’s App Store). For prospective jurors who check “Other,” Plaintiffs’ proposed question would require them to list out every place, including websites, from where they ever downloaded an app. Similarly, the questions ask prospective jurors to describe their use and experience of the Google Play store in narrative form, which is unnecessarily burdensome for prospective jurors.

Second, the subparts are prejudicial to Google because they imply that the Google Play store is the only Android app store, notwithstanding the fact that a substantial majority of Android phones sold in the United States are preloaded with more than one app store (such as the Samsung Galaxy Store). The last subpart unfairly seeks prospective jurors' "especially good or bad experience[s]" with the Google Play store, but not any other sources of Android apps, such as the Galaxy Store or Plaintiff Epic's "Epic Games App." Any potentially relevant information that could be gleaned from this question related to bias for or against Google is already covered in question 2, which asks in a more balanced fashion about prospective jurors' opinions about all of the parties in the case.

Question 5: Google objects to the portion of Question 5 that states, "If you have ever spent money on online dating, did you make the purchase in the app, on a website, or both?" This question is unnecessary because Question 4 already will elicit information about which prospective jurors spent money on online dating.

III. PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES

Question 3: The subparts to this question seek additional clarifying information about a prospective juror's familiarity with various app stores and the process for downloading applications. These subparts do not impose an undue burden on prospective jurors and are comparable to other questions, to which Google has not objected, that ask prospective jurors to give an explanation for a "yes" answer. (See Questions 6-9.) The Parties have an interest in understanding a prospective juror's experience with app stores and the downloading of applications, and their general technological capabilities, which are important topics in this case.

There is no prejudice to Google from listing the Google Play Store and asking prospective jurors about their experiences with it. The Google Play Store is obviously central to this litigation, making prospective jurors' interactions and familiarity with it relevant information for the Parties in jury selection.

Question 5: The subpart to this question seeks information that is distinct from Question 4, namely whether prospective jurors who have spent money on online dating made those

1 purchases on an app, on a website, or both. Question 4, on the other hand, asks only whether and
2 how often prospective jurors have spent money on online dating. Because this subpart seeks
3 unique information, it is not unnecessary.

4 Dated: October 2, 2023

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
Christine Varney (pro hac vice)
Gary A. Bornstein (pro hac vice)
Timothy G. Cameron (pro hac vice)
Yonatan Even (pro hac vice)
Lauren A. Moskowitz (pro hac vice)
Justin C. Clarke (pro hac vice)
Michael J. Zaken (pro hac vice)
M. Brent Byars (pro hac vice)

9
10 FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)

11 Respectfully submitted,

12 By: /s/ Gary A. Bornstein
13 Gary A. Bornstein

14 *Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.*

15
16
17 Dated: October 2, 2023

BARTLIT BECK LLP
Karma M. Giulianelli

19 KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
Hae Sung Nam

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 By: /s/ Karma M. Giulianelli
22 Karma M. Giulianelli

23 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Class in In re*
24 *Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

1 Dated: October 2, 2023

OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY
GENERAL

2
3 Brendan P. Glackin
Lauren Weinstein

4
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 By: /s/ Lauren Weinstein
Lauren Weinstein

7 *Counsel for Plaintiff States*

8 Dated: October 2, 2023

HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP
9 Douglas J. Dixon
Christine Woodin
10 Joseph A. Reiter

11 Respectfully submitted,

12 By: /s/ Douglas J. Dixon
13 Douglas J. Dixon

14 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Match Group, LLC*
15 *et al.*

16 Dated: October 2, 2023

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
17 Brian C. Rocca
Sujal J. Shah
18 Minna L. Naranjo
Rishi P. Satia
19 Michelle Park Chiu

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 By: /s/ Brian C. Rocca
22 Brian C. Rocca

23 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: October 2, 2023

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

2 Glenn D. Pomerantz

3 Kyle W. Mach

Kuruvilla Olasa

4 Justin P. Raphael

Emily C. Curran-Huberty

Jonathan I. Kravis (*pro hac vice*)

5 Lauren Bell (*pro hac vice*)

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Lauren Bell

8 Lauren Bell

9 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

E-FILING ATTESTATION

I, Lauren Bell, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has concurred in this filing.

/s/ Lauren Bell

Lauren Bell